IN THE DRAWINGS:

Please amend Fig. 1 to add the label 'Related Art', as indicated on the attached Replacement Sheet.

REMARKS

In response to the final office action mailed November 25, 2005, applicants have amended Fig.1. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application for reconsideration.

The drawings were objected to because of a requested legend in connection with Fig. 1. Applicants have amended Fig. 1 to include a 'Related Art' legend.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,796,370 (Doll) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,412,536 (Anderson). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

With respect to claims 1, 7, and 13, the Examiner admits that Doll fails to teach or suggest the recited features relating to an impingement point for cooling fluid in the enclosure is located at a position corresponding to an expected relatively hotter spot of a heat source, and relies on Anderson to provide this missing teaching. For the Examiner's convenience, the cited portion of Anderson, col. 6, lines 16-19, is reproduced below:

> "... For example, the present invention may also be used to cool high local heat flux regions requiring an inert coolant such as mirrors used in high power laser applications."

As is apparent from the foregoing, the Examiner has misconstrued the teachings of Anderson. The cited portion deals only with the general concept of liquid cooling for applications other than electronics and does not teach or suggest locating an impingement point for cooling fluid in an enclosure at a position corresponding to an expected relatively hotter spot of a heat source. In fact, Anderson fails to even mention hot spots.

Because Doll and Anderson, individually and in combination, fail to teach or suggest an impingement point for cooling fluid in the enclosure is located at a position

corresponding to an expected relatively hotter spot of a heat source, claims 1, 7, and 13 are patentable over Doll in view of Anderson.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and are likewise patentable. Claims 8-12 depend from claim 7 and are likewise patentable. Claims 14-20 depend from claim 13 and are likewise patentable. The dependent claims are separately patentable for at least the following reasons.

With respect to claims 4, 10, and 16, the final office action completely fails to address the recitations of these claims. This is clearly erroneous and fails to establish even a prima facie case of obviousness. If the case is not allowed, applicants respectfully request a new office action addressing all recitations of all claims.

In any event, both Doll and Anderson fail to teach or suggest the recited offset impingement point. Accordingly, claims 4, 10, and 16 are separately patentable over Doll in view of Anderson.

With respect to claims 5, 11, and 17, the final office action asserts that Doll discloses that the channel walls provide a high fluid channel aspect ratio since they form narrow fluid channels. The Examiner misconstrues the teaching of the Doll reference. As can be seen in many of the figures (e.g. see Figs. 3, 5, and 9), the bottom fin plate 22 with the radial fins 52 and 54 is very low profile, with relatively short fins. Although no dimensions are provided, it is clear from Figs. 8-9 that the aspect ratio is around 1:1 and certainly no more than 2:1. One of ordinary skill in the art would not consider that the channel walls disclosed in Doll provide a high fluid channel aspect ratio.

Because both Doll and Anderson fail to teach or suggest the recited high fluid channel aspect ratio, claims 5, 11, and 17 are separately patentable over Doll in view of Anderson.

With respect to claims 6, 12, and 18, the final office action asserts that Doll discloses that the fluid inlet 48 and the fluid outlet 50 are co-located since they are located in the same plane. Again, the Examiner misconstrues either the teaching of the Doll reference or the claim language. As would be clear to one of ordinary skill in the art from the claim language itself or with reference to the specification (e.g. see paragraph [0036]), co-located means in the same position or located very near to each other on the enclosure. In Doll, the fluid inlet 48 is located on the opposite side of the cold plate from the fluid outlet 50. Oppositely located inlets and outlets are as far as possible away from any reasonable reading of the term co-located. However broadly the Examiner would like to read the term 'co-located', it is unreasonably broad to read the term on oppositely located inlets and outlets. Quite simply, one of ordinary skill in the art would not consider that the inlet 48 is co-located with the outlet 50.

Because both Doll and Anderson fail to teach or suggest the recited co-located fluid inlet and fluid outlet, claims 6, 12, and 18 are separately patentable over Doll in view of Anderson.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Early notification of the same is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions regarding the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

January 25, 2006
Date

/Paul E. Steiner/
Paul E. Steiner
Reg. No. 41,326
(703) 633 - 6830

Intel Americas, Inc.
LF3
4030 Lafayette Center Drive
Chantilly, VA 20151